

Application No. 09/873,267
Response Under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 dated October 14, 2004
Response to the Office Action of July 14, 2004

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1-3 have been amended, as described below. The rejections set forth in the Office Action are respectfully traversed below.

Applicant's Response to the Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over **Rosenthal** (U.S. Patent No. 4,874,996). The Office Action asserted that **Rosenthal** discloses a method of retrieving a part of a production machine. Applicant respectfully disagrees. **Rosenthal** actually discloses an apparatus which positions tools used to produce and shape a wood product via computer aided drafting. The apparatus of **Rosenthal** does not retrieve information about the tools of the machine. Rather, it retrieves information about the wooden product *to be produced by a machine*, and controls the position of the tools accordingly in order for the product to be produced and shaped. See column 7, lines 19-34.

In contrast, claim 1 recites "retrieving a part of a production machine," where one of the steps is "retrieving machine part information." The machine part information is defined to be information about parts *of the production machine*. See page 9, line 12-page 11, line 8 of the specification. There is no disclosure of how or what the production machine ultimately produces. The claimed invention is directed to a method of detecting and replacing consumed or defective parts *of the production machine* and retrieving new parts *for the production machine*. Applicant respectfully clarifies that the "parts" of the claimed invention are components of a production

Application No. 09/873,267
Response Under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 dated October 14, 2004
Response to the Office Action of July 14, 2004

machine, *not products made by a production machine*. See page 12, lines 41-21 of the specification.

Claim 1 also recites "inputting retrieval conditions." This claimed feature achieves the retrieval of replacements for consumed or defective parts of the production machine. Rosenthal does not disclose or suggest the retrieval of parts in any manner. See page 17, line 13-page 19, line 9 of the specification. Furthermore, claim 1 has been amended to improve the form of the claim for greater clarity.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses the present rejections. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



John P. Kong
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,054

JPK/kal
1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 822-1100 (t)
(202) 822-1111 (f)